DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 752 SP 029 398

AUTHOR Richardson-Koehler, Virginia; Fenstermacher, Gary D.
TITLE Graduate Programs of Teacher Education and the Professionalization of Teaching [Revised.]
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Differentiated Staffs; Educational Change; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Organizational Development; *Professional Recognition; Program Length; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Holmes Group Report; *Nation Prepared (A)

ABSTRACT

Some recent education reform proposals call for two essential and interrelated structural changes: changes in the organization of teaching, and a change from undergraduate to graduate degree status for initial teacher preparation. This paper examines these arguments for professionalizing teaching, and raises doubts that the goals set forth in the reports would be realized by the forms of professionalization proposed. The particular forms of the professionalization of teaching proposed in the Carnegie Commission and Holmes Group reports are examined. Questions are raised on the effects these forms might have on schools and their students, and on the possibility of other ways to help teachers become experts without the potentially adverse effects of proposed structural changes in teaching. These questions are answered by examining the key characteristics of the Holmes Group and Carnegie proposals and the grounds upon which they are based. It is suggested that the particular forms of professionalization offered in these reports may neither be desirable nor necessary to the restructuring of teacher education programs. Alternatives that are more likely to succeed in achieving the larger goals in these reports are discussed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. Richardson-Koehler

G. Fenstermacher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

GRADUATE PROGRAMS OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF TEACHING[1]

Virginia Richardson-Koehler
and
Gary D Fenstermacher

College of Education
University of Arizona

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED292752

Some recent education reform proposals call for two essential and interrelated structural changes: changes in the organization of teaching, and a change from undergraduate to graduate degree status for initial teacher preparation (see, for example, "The Phoenix Agenda", Joyce & Clift, 1984; The Council of Chief State School Officer's Staffing the Nation's Schools, 1984; the Carnegie report, A Nation Prepared, 1986; the Holmes Group, Tomorrow's Teachers, 1986.). While much has been written in support and critical of these proposed changes (see for example, the entire issues of Teachers College Record, Spring, 1987, and Educational Policy, vol. 1, no. 1, 1987), the goal these reforms are presumably to achieve, the professionalization of teaching, is seldom questioned. This chapter examines the arguments for professionalizing teaching, and raises doubts that the laudable goals set forth in the reports would be realized by the form of professionalization proposed therein.

While other chapters in this volume examine aspects of the reform proposals related to the graduate preparation of teaching, this chapter explores what appears to be the raison d'etre for the reform proposals: to raise the status of the teaching occupation to a profession. Specifically, we will examine the particular form of the professionalization of teaching proposed in these reports. What effects might this form have on schools and their students? Are there other ways of helping teachers become experts without the potentially adverse effects of the proposed structural changes in teaching? We answer these questions by examining the key characteristics of the Holmes Group and Carnegie proposals and the grounds on which they are based. We suggest that the particular form of professionalization proposed in these reports may neither be desirable nor necessary to the restructuring of teacher education programs; and that there may be alternatives that are more likely to succeed in achieving the larger goals expressed in these reports.

SP029398

---

[1]A revised version of a paper presented at the Rutgers Invitational Symposium on Education, New Brunswik, N.J., May, 1987. The paper will appear as a chapter in Anita Woolfolk, Ed., Beyond the Debate: Research Perspectives on Graduate Teacher Preparation (Prentice-Hall, 1988).

Key Characteristics of Reform Proposals

Many of the key proposals in the Holmes and Carnegie reports are aimed at upgrading the status of the profession and of colleges of education. This upgrading will occur, the reformers believe, through structural changes in elementary and secondary schools and new requirements for initial teacher preparation. Both reports stress the interactive nature of the changes--that alterations of the kind proposed for teacher education cannot be accomplished without corresponding alterations in school settings. As Judge (1987) notes, it is "the nature of teaching and the distribution of teaching tasks and rewards that must first be changed. Only then can claims for any form of professional status be realistically sustained" (p. 32).

Both the Carnegie and Holmes reports appear to be motivated by a strong desire to improve the quality of education, but the reasons for improvement are grounded in quite different perspectives. The Carnegie report ties our declining performance in the world economic system to the abysmal state of education, and suggests that this problem threatens our democratic roots. The Holmes report is less dramatic and simply suggests that the dissatisfaction with schooling in America is longstanding and increasing; therefore both teaching and efforts aimed at improving teaching need to change. The Carnegie report is rooted more in economic and political argument, a predictable slant, given the business and commercial membership of the commission. The Holmes report has much of the flavor of the modern academy; given its authorship by deans of education in research universities, this perspective comes as no surprise.

Structural Changes in Schooling and Teacher Education

Both reports propose that teachers should receive their initial teacher preparation in graduate rather than undergraduate programs. In the Carnegie report, this feature is initially introduced as a means of raising the status of teaching such that the public would be willing to pay higher salaries to teachers. Both reports stress the need for a good subject matter and liberal arts undergraduate experience, and a one or two year graduate credentialing or Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T) program. The present elementary undergraduate major, they suggest, is weak in subject matter courses; while the secondary undergraduate major is light on professional preparation courses.

The Holmes Group report suggests that the professional preparation courses should be improved by focussing on the teaching of specific subjects, based on recent research in these areas. The Carnegie report suggests that the National Standards Board's licensing exams will, in part, determine the curriculum for the preparation programs.

Reform in elementary and secondary schools is an essential element of both reports. This reform includes some means of hierarchically differentiating staff functions, providing more pay to those at higher levels, and permitting more faculty involvement in decision making. The

Holmes Group career ladder proposal includes the three levels of instructor, professional teacher, and career professional. Individuals would be selected for these levels on the basis of their initial and later formal preparation. The Instructor would begin teaching after receiving a B.A., the professional teacher would require an M.A. in teaching, and the career professional, a doctoral degree or the equivalent. The levels would be differentiated on the basis of degree of autonomy, salary, and extra-instructional functions. The lead teacher of the Carnegie Report is similar to the Holmes Group career professional. Both the lead teacher and the career professional would be involved in staff development, school decisionmaking, etc. Lead teachers would receive an Advanced Teaching Certificate from the National Board of Standards, and would require some advanced graduate work.

Teachers Viewed as Change Agents

In both reports, teachers are viewed as the primary agents for improving the quality of education; consequently they are the persons most affected by the proposed reforms. Because the reports focus on teachers rather than on teaching, they consider teacher characteristics, supply, demand and incentives rather than classroom activities. Concern is expressed about the quality of students entering teaching and attention is directed to attracting more intellectually capable teachers. Better entering students are necessary to attain, through teacher preparation, the ideal described by the Holmes Group Report: "competent teachers empowered to make principled judgments and decisions on their students' behalf. . . .[who are] careful not to bore, confuse, or demean students. . . .[and who] are especially critical for these growing numbers of educationally at-risk children" (Tomorrow's Teachers, pp. 28-29). For the Carnegie report, these people "have a good grasp of the ways in which all kinds of social systems work, . . . must think for themselves if they are to help others think for themselves, be able to act independently and collaborate with others, and render critical judgment" (p. 25).

Both reports suggest that we can attract such persons with higher pay and a more "professional" work environment. A professional environment is regarded as one that is more autonomous and less bureaucratized than is presently the case. It is one where teachers share in the decision making, and participate in non classroom-focussed activities such as inducting new teachers into the system.

The two reports differ on which institution should be the initiator of reform and guardian of standards. For the Holmes Group report, it is the loosely federated research universities that set standards for teacher education and exchange research-based knowledge about teaching practice. In the Carnegie report, it is a newly created National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, with a majority of members elected by Board-certified teachers.

Assumptions in the Reform Proposals

The two major forms of structural change proposed in the reports, the graduate degree status of initial teacher preparation and the differentiation of the teaching occupation, are designed to meet two interrelated goals: increasing the quality of education for all students and professionalizing the teaching occupation. Arguments showing the relationship between the structural changes and increasing the quality of education are not well articulated in either report. The value of the specific form of professionalization proposed is virtually unexamined. We wonder whether the proposed view of teaching and schooling will indeed improve the quality of education, and whether professionalizing the teaching occupation in the manner suggested is a goal to which we should aspire.

As Judge (1987) points out, the proposal for graduate degree programs in teacher training requires a change in the structure of the teaching occupation. The change proposed is the hierarchical differentiation of staffing. These changes are proposed for both elementary and secondary schools, and are designed to provide a higher quality of education by attracting and retaining higher quality teachers. These higher quality teachers will be attracted to and retained in teaching because the sustained work of obtaining higher degrees will be rewarded with higher status positions in the school hierarchy and higher pay. However, the range of possible effects of such a system on the education of our students is not examined. Indeed, it is simply assumed that advanced graduate preparation and the concomitant hierarchically structured teaching occupation will bring great educational value to students and teachers, and presumably to parents and the general citizenry, as well. These contentions and assumptions deserve more careful scrutiny, beginning with the notion of professionalizing teaching.

The Professionalization of Teaching

All of the recent reform reports argue that teaching can and should be considered a profession, and that teachers ought to be regarded as professionals. Indeed this aspiration is accepted as if it were virtually a divine right of teachers. Denied status and credibility for so long, teachers now have the opportunity to gain what is rightfully theirs. Recognition as a professional is presumed to follow the so-called "knowledge base" that has emerged in the field of teaching. This knowledge base, it is argued, places teaching among the highly specialized human service fields, and requires that teachers be accorded extensive autonomy and control over their work settings. It is presumed that teaching will achieve its rightful place in the same historically inevitable way as law and medicine achieved theirs. Almost no one asks whether we truly wish teachers to be like lawyers and physicians, or whether they could be like lawyers and physicians and still retain all that we regard as excellent about teaching. A closer look at the parallels yields some interesting insights.

One does not need a scientific study to gain a sense of the typical relationships between physicians and patients. All verbal communication is couched in the title "Doctor _____." One seldom sees a physician's name without the "M.D." following it, unless the physician specifically wishes not be identified as such (as when an airline passenger). Physicians infrequently discuss their processes and procedures with patients, and rarely explain what they are doing (save in the most simple, typically condescending ways). After an encounter with a physician, the patient may have a vague idea what is wrong, and some modest procedures for curing oneself (e. g., take three of these pills a day [you may not know what you are taking], check into this hospital, go to that laboratory for these tests).

This behavior has been quite characteristic of those most likely to be regarded as professionals. It is as if they are saying to their patients or clients: "Do what I tell you to do and you will be well again (or safe, or free), but do not try to do what I do, and do not--under any circumstances--try to figure things out for yourself." The occupations we usually think of as professions place considerable distance between the provider and the recipient. This distance is zealously protected, by arcane language, by technical procedures, by licensure, and a number of other devices that mystify and distance the client or patient.

Second thoughts on professionalizing teaching

Given these untoward consequences of professionalization in medicine and law, it seems a propitious time, in the face of calls for professionalization of teaching, to pause, and ask whether it might not be advantageous to inquire how the professionalization of teaching will affect the relationship between the teacher and the learner, and almost as important, the relationship between teacher and parent. Many of the indications we have from law and medicine are that the trappings of professionalization will increase the social, communication, and psychological gap between the provider and recipient, and between provider and the recipient's significant others. Soder (1986) puts the point well:

> Professionalization is a tempting strategy for groups aspiring to higher status. However, the strategy is usually one selected more on the basis of sidelong glances at purportedly successful occupations that have made the grade than on the basis of careful calculation. In the rush to get on with it, the risks of professionalization strategies are often ignored. The strategy, for example, can have the effect of reducing professional stature and authority . . . .(p. 5)

Might there be a better approach to capitalizing on our enhanced knowledge about teaching, while gaining the credibility needed to act effectively as a teacher?

Our concern is that we not ape the known, highly regarded professions merely because there are some historical parallels between their

evolution and that of teaching, or because we are frustrated with the perceived lack of status and prestige afforded to the occupation of school teacher. There is enough that strikes us as unsatisfactory about law and medicine as professions that we might specifically wish to avoid becoming what they have become. (We wish to take nothing away from the good work of physicians and lawyers, rather only to object to some of the ways these occupations have come to be organized and extended in society). In place of teaching becoming a profession like law and medicine, we might consider law and medicine becoming a profession like teaching might become (Shulman, 1985).

There may be some merit to this thought, as both law and medicine have recently become more educative in the way their practitioners work. Physicians are more willing to teach patients how to diagnose common maladies, and care for themselves. For example, many parents are now trusted by physicians to use an otoscope to examine and diagnose recurring ear infections in their children, and--mirabile dictu--the parents might even be trusted to initiate the taking of an antibiotic (with, of course, the proviso that the child is brought in to the physician's office first thing Monday morning). Lawyers have expressed support for client involvement in law, through such mechanisms as small claims court and the self-preparation of basic legal documents. Thus, there are signs of lawyers and physicians wanting to enable and empower their clients by teaching them how to do the things they do.

This "new look" in law and medicine might lead a skeptic to toss off our concern about teachers becoming like physicians and lawyers with the comment that some professionals have simply developed poor manners in the course of occupational maturation. The skeptic might say that some distancing and mystification are a small price for all the good that has come to humanity. Physicians have made great strides in keeping us well, and lawyers have, despite our always poking fun at them, helped the society to uphold and sustain its commitment to the rule of law. Why, then, fret over these relatively mild consequences of professionalization? Furthermore, recognizing these mildly unsavory consequences ahead of time might even permit us to fine tune the occupational maturation of teaching so that it successfully avoids these minor pitfalls.

This is a tempting rebuttal to our concern, but one unlikely to succeed. The difference in aims between teaching, on the one hand, and law and medicine, on the other, is, by itself, sufficient to lead us to ask whether copying the occupational maturation of law and medicine will diminish or enhance the capacity of teaching to achieve its aims. Furthermore, the context for the professionalization of teaching seems to be very different from that for the other major professions. In the case of teaching, the reformers are proposing altering the character of an occupation that is nested within a highly developed and complex system of schooling. Both these points merit further discussion, and we will consider each in some depth. We turn first to the system of schooling, then follow that with a look at the aims of teaching.

Teaching in the context of school systems

In his provocative analysis of the emergence of the common school in American society, Katz (1975) argues that during the half century from 1800 to 1850, Americans had a choice about how the nation might organize education. Katz contends that there were four possible models of organization, and there were systems of schooling in place exemplifying each of the models. As the nation moved into the mid nineteenth century, one model became increasingly dominant, that of incipient bureaucracy. By the late 1800s, that model dominated nearly all education in the U.S. There may be an instructive parallel here, for this present period in our history may be one of choices among competing models for framing the occupation of teaching. We are concerned that the recent reform reports have closed off discussion of possibilities other than professionalization in the manner of medicine and law.

One aspect of professionalizing teaching that is often overlooked in the reform rhetoric is the tight connection between professionalization and bureaucratization. The reform reports argue for professionalization as a means of promoting teacher autonomy in the workplace and control over the occupation itself. Overlooked in this claim that professionalization will bring autonomy and self-governance is an acknowledgment that bureaucratic organization has been the route to such professionalization as presently obtains in teaching. Yet, despite the fact that bureaucratization has served as a mechanism for professionalization, bureaucratization is typically regarded as the enemy of autonomy and professional self-governance.

To explain this point, we return to one of the organizational models discussed by Katz (1975), called "democratic localism." Democratic localism is a form of local control, with a high degree of parent and community participation (a kind of "town meeting" governance of schooling). Efficiency and organizational rationality are far less regarded in democratic localism than responsiveness, public control, and local involvement. It is most interesting to note the reasons Katz gives for the failure of democratic localism to become the dominant form of school organization: "The feature [of democratic localism] that has encouraged the most deviation has been antiprofessionalism. Democratic localists in most places were forced to recognize the appalling quality of teaching and, despite their ideological preference, realized the need to develop professional teaching training." (p. 49)

What is not immediately obvious in the modern reformers' calls for professionalization, but becomes quite clear in historical perspective, is that there is a close relationship between the bureaucratization of schooling and the professionalization of teaching. It is unlikely that teaching could have reached the state of professionalism it has attained were it not for the bureaucratization of schooling. Yet the current reform reports argue for the professionalization of teaching as if this were an antidote to the bureaucratic control of teaching. That view misses, we think, the very intimate connection between the bureaucratic

organization of schooling and the professional character of teaching in school settings.[1]

This historical perspective raises a question whether the professionalization of teaching can be sustained outside the bureaucratic structure of schooling. The Holmes Group and Carnegie Commission participants may have similarly troubled, for their proposals fall squarely into the web of bureaucracy. The proposals argue that the way to professionalize teaching is to structure it hierarchically, with degrees and credentials, different functions and responsibilities, and various levels of power and influence associated with each level of the hierarchy. This structure strikes us as an almost paradigmatic case of bureaucratic organization. Does it lead to higher quality education for students, or for increased autonomy and self-control for teachers? Part of the answer can be found in this case study, recently completed by one of the authors.

A Case Study in Structural Change

The hierarchical structure proposed by the Holmes Group, Carnegie and many other reports, can be examined by describing an elementary school that has restructured itself along the lines proposed in the Holmes Group report, then examining what is happening to teachers and students in that school. While one school obviously does not generalize to the universe of schooling, this case raises questions concerning the consequences of such restructuring.

Desert View is an elementary school that has been examined in depth as a part of a study of at-risk students funded by the Exxon Foundation (Richardson-Koehler, Casanova, Placier, and Guilfoyle, 1987). The focus was on the schooling experiences of six at-risk grade-three students in each of two schools. An understanding of these experiences was gained by interviewing the students, their parents, teachers and other experts in the school, and the principal. The students were observed in their classrooms, and school features were noted by the enthnographers.

Desert View is a K-6 Elementary School in a lower middle class suburb of a medium-sized Southwestern city. Approximately eighty percent of the students were Bilingual or Limited English Proficient. For two years preceding the study, the faculty and administrative staff of Desert View had been engaged in a reform process. Together, they read the extensive reform literature, developed a five-year plan and radically reorganized the delivery of instruction. The new structure involved working in teams of two or three grade levels. Teachers taught to their strengths, and self-contained classrooms were no longer the norm: students moved from teacher to teacher depending upon the subject matter and individually diagnosed problems.

A career ladder plan in the district allowed the school to promote a number of their teachers to team leaders. These individuals taught for a half a day, and worked on leadership activities for the other half. The students went home early one day a week, providing a considerable amount

of time for the teams to meet. The teachers actively participated in the governance of the school.

The school was known for its handling of learning disabled children. A number of experts were associated with the school, and the teachers themselves received training in the various categories of Learning Disabilities. The teachers participated as peers with the experts in diagnosing problems and providing remediation for these children.

The effects of this system on the teachers in Desert View was to shift a considerable amount of their time and attention away from their students and classroom toward the systemics of school: collective planning and decision making, and staff development. The Team Leader, for example, taught in the morning and performed leadership activities in the afternoon. Such activities, in fact, involved a considerable amount of paper work rather than contact with other teachers.

The teachers appeared to be ambivalent about this structure. On the one hand, they liked the idea of common goals, and other teachers being responsible, part of the time, for their children. On the other hand, they were uncomfortable with giving up their students for even a part of the day, because they had less of a sense of the whole child when they were not in their home classroom. The one exception to this was the least effective and least confident teacher who seemed perfectly willing to allow other teachers and the specialists to take over the responsibility for her "problem" students.

The new structure created considerable management problems, with students constantly moving in and out of the classroom. The Team Leaders gave up their classrooms for one-half of every day, and at least in the team that was observed, considerable time was devoted to the team leader and her substitute (also an experienced teacher) resolving differences. Further, the newly structured system created considerable stress, particularly at evaluation time. While the teachers agreed upon the general goals, they differed considerably on the means to implement them. Discussions of implementation strategies were extremely stressful for the teachers. Such ambivalence about systemics activities has also been described by Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding, and Cuthbert (in press).

The day seemed very choppy for all students, but particularly for those needing the extra help. Students' completion of assignments and worksheets was of importance to all teachers, and the at-risk students often missed recess in order to catch up with their fellow students on their assignments. A Learning Disabled student could be in contact with five or six experts/teachers in one day, rushing from classroom to classroom. The observed students were exhausted at the end of the day (as was the observer).

Regular students could experience two homeroom teachers and a number of others in one day. The lesson segments were short and there was little coherence among them. The teachers differed considerably in terms of

their management systems, classroom communication rules, and behavioral and content learning expectations.

The faculty and principal of the school prided themselves on good contact with the parents of their students. They were all bilingual and knew the neighborhood well. Indeed, the climate of the school was warm and caring. However, it was clear from the interviews with teachers and parents that communications were less than perfect. Two of the at-risk students in the sample were described by teachers as foster children. It took one call on the part of the researcher to determine that neither was. One stayed with her aunt after school until the mother could pick her up after work, and the other lived with his mother. The parents who were seen in the school were in the cafeteria, garden or office rather than in the classrooms.

This school represents just one example of the type of school structure proposed in the recent reports that is required to support graduate level teacher preparation programs in research universities. What was happening to teachers and students in that school may relate to some factors other than the staffing structure in the school. Further, the problems encountered may be specific to elementary schools. Nonetheless the case poses some issues that must be considered in the push toward redesigning elementary and secondary schools in the image of higher education. The following themes emerged from the case study, and deserve further exploration:

- Teachers spent more time on systemics and less time on instruction.

The systemics include team meetings for collective decision making, meetings with other team teachers and experts concerning individual children, staff development and evaluation. Since teachers who are involved in these activities are not in classrooms with students, one of four things must happen: the day must be shortened, teachers must stay longer in school, class sizes become larger or more teachers or other adults be hired. At Desert View, the amount of time students spent in school was shortened, and more teachers were hired. While this may not be a problem for the individual teacher, it places great burdens on schools and problems for the children. The system becomes much more complex, creating increased management problems. Interpersonal communications and potential for conflict are increased.

- Contact with a number of teachers during the school day created both educational and social problems for individual students.

The teachers in Desert View felt that the team approach taught students to become adaptable as they moved from one teacher to the next. While adaptability may be considered a virtue, such learning may become more important to students than other types of learning such as cognitive skills. Further, such a system may be particularly detrimental to low achieving students. Good (1986, p. 101) pointed out that low achieving students have a particularly difficult time moving from one teacher to

another. Further, an excessive amount of time was spent in transitions from classroom to classroom.

- o A hierarchically differentiated staffing system places higher status on the functions not performed by those at the lowest level: in this case, on systemics activities.

A model for hierarchically differentiated staffing can be found in higher education. In these institutions, teaching is the least admired and rewarded function. Most of the lower level courses are taken over by graduate students, lecturers or assistant professors. In the case of colleges of education. these junior-level instructors take the brunt of being the lowest status faculty members in an already low status College. The tension between producing research and teaching is felt strongly by teacher educators who are committed to teaching (Koehler, 1984).

This system is now being proposed for elementary and secondary schools. The Instructors would do the low level teaching; the career professionals would have more autonomy and would be more involved in collective decision making; and the Lead teachers would be only partially involved in teaching. The systemics, therefore, become more important than teaching, and those performing them receive greater rewards.

The tensions between teaching and performing systemics will undoubtedly be stressful to many teachers. At the Schenley High School Teacher Center in Pittsburgh, for example, a number of the Clinical Resident Teachers (CRT's) asked to go back to regular teaching after one or two years because of the stress they felt concerning this tension. The CRT's worked with Visiting Teachers as clinicians, ran seminars and continued to teach. They felt themselves to be, first and foremost, teachers; the other staff development activities took them away from their primary function, and the stress of balancing both was severe (Bickel & Pine, 1984).

It is perhaps the case that the flat organization of schooling has been highly functional in the performance of its primary activity: teaching. Structures for the differentiation of staffing must be developed so as to maintain the priority of the teaching function while allowing teachers some leeway to perform necessary and interesting functions. As Conley & Bacharach (1987) point out:

> It is not necessary to change the job structure in teaching to promote a model of internship and development. That is, there is nothing inherent in the existing job structure of public education that prevents districts from involving teachers in decision making, providing them with more development support, or creating internships for teachers. (p. 34)

Surely a structure could be developed that would be comparable with the egalitarian norms of the teaching occupation (Lortie, 1978), and would at the same time enhance the conditions of teaching. The consideration of

egalitarianism leads quite naturally into a discussion of the democratic ideals of teaching.

Teaching in a Democracy

Earlier in the chapter we stated that the reform proposals did not adequately account for interrelationship of the structural or systemic properties of schooling and the call for professionalizing teaching. We also stated that the proposals did not examine the relationship between the aims of education and the call for restructuring teaching and teacher education. We examined the structural aspects of schooling and professionalization in the prior discussion. We turn now to the matter of the aims of education, and the effects on these aims of the call for restructuring teaching and teacher education.

The nexus of democracy and education is so thoroughly a part of academic discussions of education that elaborate justification is not needed here. One need only recall Jefferson's words to be reminded of the essential connection: "That nation which expects to be both ignorant and free--in a state of civilization--expects what never was and never will be" (quoted in Cremin, 1966, p. 5). Nearly every major theorist of democracy has argued that the extension of the franchise to all adults is meaningless if every adult cannot participate, by reason of ignorance, in the civic life of the nation. Put bluntly, democracy is an empty ideal without an educated citizenry.

Of course, as Wringe (1984) points out, there are multiple versions of democracy, not all of them calling for the elaborate education of every adult in the nation. In corporate democracies, a small governing body is empowered to make decisions intended to insure the welfare of all concerned. In liberal democracies, on the other hand, the people themselves have a voice in shaping what is in their best interest. Pratte (1987, p. 159) states this idea succinctly: "The point of participatory democracy is that those involved, those who will be most affected by the decision to be made or the action to be taken, actually take part in the discussion and take the decision, and the responsibility for the decision, themselves." The United States has, since its founding, sought to be a liberal democracy, with participatory democracy serving as the highest attainment of the liberal theory of democracy.

To achieve this end, schools were founded in order to extend the privilege of democratic participation to the people. This commitment to schools began early in the life of the nation, and has continued through the present. Article III of The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 indicates just how early a fledgling nation pledged itself to education: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This nation has committed itself to full equality of educational opportunity in a way that no other nation of the past has done, nor has any other nation in these times dedicated itself to this end with both the conviction and the resources that have characterized the U. S.

The American dream of full equality for all is a distinctly democratic ideal, deeply dependent on education as its primary means of realization. Given our dependence on education to realize the democratic ideal, it is odd that there has been so little discussion of the impact of teaching reform proposals on the relation between education and democracy. The reform reports do make the customary, now perhaps mandatory, mention of this nation as a democracy dependent on its schools and teachers. The Carnegie Report, for example, expresses concern about our status as a world leader, and the relative academic showing of our students in comparison with the children of other nations. The Holmes Group advocates a strong teaching force as a contribution to the educational accomplishments of the nation. But neither report examines in much detail the impact of its recommendations on the duties and opportunities for teachers to contribute to the realization of the democratic ideal.

For example, take the quite simple point that Carnegie and Holmes propose hierarchies of teacher attainment, autonomy for teachers, and a strong voice in governing the affairs of the school. What kind of a democracy is being put into place with these proposals? More importantly, how democratically are such teachers likely to behave in their dealings with other school and non-school personnel? At a minimum, these reform proposals suggest an elite cadre of teachers, whose primary cachet is specialized knowledge and a capacity to perform in ways that are currently regarded as effective.

Given the ethos of teaching built up from the reform proposals, what is the likelihood that the teacher trained according to these reform programs will be committed to democratic ideals in his or her own teaching behavior--much less in creating classroom environments that reflect democratic ideals and principles? We see, instead, in the reform proposals, a kind of political conservatism and epistemological conceit--wherein one's interest is in applying technical expertise to remediate diagnosed deficiencies and produce pupils whose test-taking performance is nearly as good as that of their teachers (all of whom, if the proposals before us succeed, will themselves have taken tests to get into the profession, to become licensed to teach, and to hold advanced professional standing in the teaching hierarchy).

It is not here contended that the such reform proposals as Carnegie and Holmes are anti-democratic. Rather, we wish to consider the possibility that teachers of the kind argued for in the Carnegie and Holmes Reports may not serve the democratic ideal well, and, if we are correct, what might be done to prevent this consequence. As mentioned above, perhaps there is more to the desire of many teachers for a "flat" organization of teaching than we have previously been willing to consider. Such a structure may permit more equality of consideration and influence than would be the case with the tiered organizations argued for in Carnegie and Holmes. Further, a flat structure of this kind may send a far more democratic message to learners than the hierarchical and bureaucratized structures now under consideration.

Jane Roland Martin (1987) recently criticized the Holmes agenda in something of the way we are inclined to do here. Contending that the Holmes' proposals for the liberal education of teachers smacked of the preparation of Platonic guardians, Martin said that the Holmes Group failed to "consider the consequences for the hidden curriculum of schooling of an undergraduate teacher education designed along Platonic lines." Martin then asks whether we should "not expect that those who have been taught to lead a guardian's life will pass on to their pupils the guardian's disdain for manual labor, ambivalence about practical action, and distrust of feeling and emotion?" (p. 408).

Perhaps Martin exaggerates here, as it is unlikely that educating teachers or pupils as Platonic guardians would succeed, no matter how hard we tried. Yet the underlying point should not be lost: New knowledge and skill can as easily serve as a mechanism for gaining status and prestige as for personal freedom and the liberation of the mind. Depending on how the knowledge and skill are articulated systemically, they may be used far more as an occasion for status and control than for freedom and liberation. The consequences of this outcome for the nexus between democracy and education are enormous. The manner and form of professionalizing teaching may diminish the teacher's capacity to establish democratic environments, act on democratic principles, and model democratic behavior, or it may enhance these capacities. We believe that the reform proposals placed before us by the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Commission deserve careful scrutiny from this perspective.

Reconsidering Professionalization

There is much that is good in the Carnegie and Holmes proposals. There is also much that we believe is the occasion for concern. Our concern is that the learner is not drowned in the bath water that the reformers seem to want to use to clean up teaching and teacher education. We believe there is an important and expanding knowledge base about teaching and schooling, and that it can and should be used by teachers. (Indeed, one of us is responsible for a rather hefty book that addresses research-based practices for educational practitioners; see Richardson-Koehler, 1987). We believe that teacher education and schooling must be restructured. We believe that teachers deserve more societal praise and support than they are receiving.

We also believe that the system of schooling, as it is now structured and run, may have within it some features that ought to be more fully understood, and perhaps retained. The relatively flat organizational structure for teaching may have great utility for effecting cooperation and collegiality, in ways that might be more worthwhile and successful than universities have been able to attain. This same one-dimensional structure may also permit a greater exercise of democratic governance and modeling than would be the case with a more hierarchical structure. With regard to the education of teachers, the short period of professional preparation that currently characterizes initial teacher preparation may, on further scrutiny, be grounded in quite good and proper reasons--though

in our haste to make schools look more like universities, we may not be able to see what is worthwhile in what is already there. Perhaps teachers-in-training are already taught more than they can possibly apply in practice--until such time as they have practical experience to use as a base for acquiring further academic knowledge.

In a provocative essay on the professionalization of teachers, Hoyle (1985) discusses the difficulty of navigating between advanced knowledge and theory, and a practical, human orientation to the persons being served. He wonders whether the established professions, were they still in the early stages of their development, might not also be addressing the same questions that now puzzle us about professionalizing teaching. Hoyle concludes:

> It is unlikely that teaching will become the new model profession. However, it is possible that if teaching can improve the ways in which practitioners acquire and utilize practice-relevant knowledge, its clientele will benefit greatly. The paradox is that it is unlikely to enhance its own status in the process. (p. 53)

If we ignore the sociology of knowledge, we could, perhaps, argue that there is no dichotomy between knowledge and expertise on the one hand, and contextually wise and personally concerned practice on the other. Indeed, we would then say that persons are better served when those who serve them are steeped in the knowledge of their field and skilled at its practice. This view is certainly the one adopted in the Holmes Group and Carnegie Commission reports. Yet, so far as we can ascertain, there is little in the sociology of knowledge, the sociology of organizations, the history of education, or the political science of democracies that permits us to embrace the professionalization proposals of the reform reports in the form they are presented.

There are, indeed, tensions--sometimes dilemmas--between the individual and the organization, the scholar and the practitioner, the expert and the democrat, and between the medical and legal occupations and the teaching occupation. Our challenge is to come to grips with these tensions and dilemmas in ways that promote education as a means to liberate the mind and enable morally grounded action, in ways that encourage teachers to think and act as they desire their students to think and act, and in ways that sustain and promote the continuous process of inducting new citizens into democratic governance.

Until we have faced these issues in a more probing and illuminative way, there is much to recommend making but minor adjustments that reflect good sense and good practice. As Thomas Green (1984) reminds us, institutions are resistant to change for good reasons and bad. Among the good reasons is that those who argue for change may see the existing imperfections imperfectly, and were our vision clearer, the way things are may be far more sensible than they appear at first. As we gain clearer focus and firmer purchase on the world that is there, perhaps we will think quite differently about the world we want to achieve.

Bibliography

Adler, S. (1985). The irony of professionalism. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Atkin, J.M. (1985). Preparing to go to the head of the class. The Wingspread Journal (Special Section on Teacher Education), pp. 1-3.

Bickel, & Pine (1984). Notes on Center Development: Memo to Board of Visitors. Pittsburgh, PA: Schenley High School Teacher Center, Pittsburgh School District.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Carnegie Foundation.

Conley, S. & Bacharach, S. (1987). The Holmes Group Report: Standards, hierarchies, and management. In J. Soltis (Ed.), Reforming teacher education, pp. 30-37. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cremin, L. A. (1966). The Genius of American Public Education. N. Y.: Vintage Books.

Doyle, W. (1976). Education for all: The triumph of professionalism. In O. C. Davis, Jr. (Ed.), Perspectives on curriculum development, 1776-1976. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Eisenhart, M., Shrum, J., Harding, J., Cuthbert, A. (In press). Teacher beliefs: Definitions, findings, and directions. Educational Policy.

Good, T. (1986). What is learned in Elementary Schools. In Tomlinson, T.M., & Walberg, H.L. Academic Work and Educational Excellence, pp. 87-114. San Francisco: McCutchan.

Green, T. F. (1984). The formation of conscience in an age of technology. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Hawley, D. (1986). A critical analysis of the Holmes Group's proposals for reforming teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education. pp. 47-51.

Holmes Group Executive Board. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing: MI: Holmes Group.

Hoyle, E. (1985). The professionalization of teachers: A paradox. In Is Teaching a profession?, Bedford Way Papers, No. 15. London: University of London Press, 2d edition, pp. 44-54.

Joyce, B. & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, pp. 5-18.

Judge, H. (June, 1987). Reforming teacher education: A view from abroad. Education Week, 6, 39, p. 32.

Koehler, V. (1984). University supervision of student teaching. Report No. 9061. Austin, Texas: R & D Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas. ERIC No.

Lortie, D. (1978). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Martin, J. R. (1987). Reforming teacher education, rethinking liberal education. Teachers College Record, 88, 405-409.

Martin, J.R. (1987). Reforming teacher education, rethinking liberal education. Teachers College Record, 88, 405-409.

Pratte, R. (1987). Social heterogeneity, democracy, and democratic pluralism. In K. D. Benne & S. Tozer (Eds.), Society as educator in an age of transition: Eighty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 148-185). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Richardson-Koehler (1987). Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective. New York: Longman.

Richardson-Koehler, V., Casanova, U., Placier, P., and Guilfoyle, K. (1987). Positioning students for success: A final report to the Exxon Education Foundation. Tucson, Arizona: College of Education, University of Arizona.

Schlechty, P. (1984). Restructuring the teaching occupation: A proposal. Paper prepared for the American Educational research Association Project: Research contributions for educational improvement. Washington, D.C.

Shulman, L. S. (1985, October). A course of treatment. Invited address to the American Association of Medical Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Soder, R. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers for whom and for what? Missing propositions in the Homes Group Report. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, 1, pp. 2 - 5.

Staffing the nation's schools: A national emergency. (1984). Washington, D.C. Council of Chief State School Officers.

Wringe, C. (1984). Democracy, schooling and political education. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Endnotes

1 The connection between professionalization and bureaucratization is explored in Adler (1985) and Doyle (1976). Doyle notes that many students of education believe that "bureaucratization somehow places an absolute limit on the possibility of professionalizing. More recent scholarship suggests, however, that the distance and conflict between these two processes are not as great as had been assumed" (p. 25).